



education review // reseñas educativas

editors: gene v glass gustavo e. fischman melissa cast-brede

a multi-lingual journal of book reviews

April 4, 2011

ISSN 1094-5296

Education Review/Reseñas Educativas is a project of the National Education Policy Center <http://nepc.colorado.edu>

Follow Education Review on Facebook



Gardner, Susan K. & Mendoza, Pilar (Eds.) (2010) *On Becoming a Scholar: Socialization and Development in Doctoral Education*. Sterling, Va.: Stylus Publishing

Pp. 281 ISBN 978-1-57922-444-5

Reviewed by Bobbie Everett Frye
North Carolina State University

What is the purpose of doctoral student preparation? “The purpose of doctoral education is to prepare scholars” (p 19). In *On Becoming a Scholar: Socialization and Development in Doctoral Education* editors Susan Gardner & Pilar Mendoza and an impressive array of scholars examine why and to what extent socialization is important to the development and preparation of scholars in the research enterprise. “Socialization is defined as the process through which an individual learns to adopt values, beliefs, norms, attitudes and knowledge needed for membership in a group, society or organization” (p 19). The authors review existing research and theory of doctoral socialization and expand an understanding of socialization to include the developmental process students

Citation: Frye, Bobbie Everett. (2011 April 4) Review of *On Becoming a Scholar* by Susan K. Gardner & Pilar Mendoza. *Education Review*, 14. Retrieved [Date] from <http://www.edrev.info/reviews/rev1062.pdf>

experience in graduate school which aligns with preparation. The authors recognize doctoral experiences vary and review the intersections of marital status, gender, age, race and discipline to illuminate a complex understanding of the graduate experience. The strength of this book is the authors collectively advocate and recommend organizational and individual change in perceptions, norms and practices in doctoral education. Strengthening programs and responding to the diverse needs of doctoral students have potential to positively impact doctoral attrition and to enhance the socialization, development and competency of future “stewards of the discipline” (Golde & Walker, 2006).

The book consists of five parts. Part I, “Setting the context” introduces the book and discusses the contribution each chapter will add to the topic of the development of scholars. The second part of the first section is a brief history of doctoral education in the United States including the beginning of doctoral education and the origins of research as a mission of the university. Part II, “Socialization for the Profession” examines the three roles of the faculty profession: teaching research and service. Part III, “Contextualizing Socialization” examines three areas of variation in graduate education: disciplinary programs, interdisciplinary programs and academic capitalism. Part IV, “Intersecting Socialization and Demographics” examines three demographics that color socialization and development: gender, marital status and race/ethnicity. Part V looks “Beyond Socialization” to the growth and development of future scholars in three areas: social identity, adult learning and epistemological development. A series of vignettes introduce each chapter. A narrative describes two students’ experiences relevant to the chapter. At the end of the book, employing the narratives, the editors offer theoretical and practical implications of the book, and demonstrate the multi-dimensional understanding of doctoral socialization harnessed in the chapters.

Chapter 1 reviews what is known about doctoral student teaching preparation. Melissa McDaniels presents the four components of preparation for future faculty: “(a) conceptual understandings; (b) knowledge and skills in the core areas of faculty work; (c) interpersonal skills; and (d)

professional attitudes and habits” (p 33). Doctoral students learn professional roles through the development and understandings of core concepts underpinning chosen disciplines. In addition, students learn the appropriate behavior of faculty members including the ability to recognize, respond and adapt to students’ learning styles and preferences. The author concludes all stakeholders in student preparation: students, faculty, departments, universities and external agencies are responsible to provide students with effective teaching abilities. Students have a stake in teaching development and need to act on their own behalf. In order to develop effective teaching skills students need opportunities to observe, analyze and reflect on teaching abilities.

In Chapter 2, John Weidman examines the process in which a student moves from a consumer of knowledge to a producer of knowledge. Research productivity is discussed as a measure of a successful scholar and a professional responsibility. The development of scholars is viewed within the context of disciplines and students’ research experiences vary among disciplines. Variables found related to research productivity are faculty and peer interaction, faculty mentoring and financial aid. Underrepresented groups reported less research productivity. The author concludes research productivity is a complex set of processes involving influences and experiences with faculty and peers, disciplinary contexts and external professional associations. Weidman recommends doctoral students seek research opportunities and faculty involve students in research activities. Departments need to educate students about faculty research interests and universities should provide financial support for research projects. External agencies such as associations should also provide funding opportunities.

The last and often overlooked aspect of faculty work, service is examined in Chapter 3. Kelly Ward argues while teaching roles are usually understood and conveyed to doctoral students, less frequently are doctoral students made aware of the service obligation in the professional faculty role. Service obligations are internal to the institution such as committee work and participation in shared governance. In addition, there is an external or community service expectation of future faculty members

such as community service, consultant work, or linking faculty research with community needs. Ward contends students need understanding of service variations among institutional types. Service in the community college setting usually involves workforce development or partnership with industry. In the comprehensive college or university faculty are engaged in community service projects. A future faculty member in a research university should balance service activities with publication requirements. Service expectations can reflect personal characteristics and under-represented faculty members are called upon to a greater extent than others to represent the views and perspectives of their group. Faculty of under-represented groups experience role conflict and tension. Doctoral programs should incorporate topics of service expectations into classroom settings. Students should serve on college committees where appropriate to gain experience in fulfilling the service role. Doctoral programs should ensure students understand and prepare for the three areas of professional obligations and responsibility. The service aspect of the faculty role is least understood or observed by future faculty members.

In Chapter 4, Chris Golde contends the experience and socialization of doctoral students vary among disciplines. In order to set the stage Golde examines the role of disciplines in that disciplines convey language, understandings, body of knowledge, and cultural norms. From the perspectives of English scholar and chemist the author contrasts three components of the dissertation: style, topic identification and advisory role. Golde argues doctoral programs are inherently restrictive and conservative. Although, the activities and experiences prepare students to work in their chosen fields the downside of disciplinary contexts is what Golde coins “disciplinary blinders” (p 92). In disciplines students lack the richness of other disciplinary perspectives and activities and can become close-minded to other approaches to scholarly work. English scholars would benefit from collaborative work but will have to work to engage in those types of activities. Similarly, scientists benefit from opportunities to self-direct and engage in creative endeavors not tied to a disciplinary context. Students can become change agents and shape the direction of the research enterprise. Golde contends the cursory review is an introduction to the topic. See Golde

(2005) for a further discussion of the argument and an examination of the role of the department and disciplines in doctoral student attrition.

In Chapter 5, Karri Holley examines the challenges inherent in interdisciplinary doctoral education and the potential for socialization in the programs. The role of the disciplines is discussed with a reference to Golde's Chapter 4. Socialization is challenging in a disciplinary academic world. Academic disciplines encourage specializations that further fragment the disciplinary boundaries. However, interdisciplinary programs pose specific challenges in a disciplinary model. Many definitions of interdisciplinary work exist, but borrowing from Newell and Green (cited in Holley) interdisciplinary work is defined as 'inquiries which critically draw upon two or more disciplines and which lead to an integration of disciplinary insights' (p 23). Crossing boundaries in research and applying knowledge from one area to another describes interdisciplinary research. Holley argues the need for interdisciplinary work emerges from societies' challenging problems, which require broader perspectives and understandings in order to effectively approach problems.

Interdisciplinary work requires scholars to connect with research, literature and topics outside of their respective disciplines. However, the siloed norm of academic disciplines is not conducive to interdisciplinary work. In order to acquire knowledge in another disciplinary area students must have a good grasp of their own disciplines and the ability to transfer knowledge into another discipline and area of inquiry. Scholars face challenges of language and communication related to jargon that must be addressed. The interdisciplinary context may require more investment in time and resources; faculty members with such skills are difficult to find, the norm publish or perish often requires faculty members publish within the specific disciplines and journals and conferences and other associations are strongly tied to disciplines. A dissertation that crosses disciplines will require strong collaboration and communication skills. Interdisciplinary programs are not part of the traditional model as funding is tied to disciplines. Holley suggests the interdisciplinary model requires a tradeoff between depth of knowledge in one area and knowledge about several disciplines. Although

challenging, scholars argue interdisciplinary programs produce students with broader understandings of complex social problems and can enhance the doctoral student experience (Golde & Gallagher, 1999; Golde & Walker, 2006; McAlpine, 2006).

Since the 1980s, doctoral students in the engineering and bio-technology fields are likely to experience a phenomenon known as academic capitalism, which is research sponsored by industry. In Chapter 6, Pilar Mendoza explores the pros and cons of academic capitalism. On the one hand, students serve as potential recruits to industry, are socialized to the work role, and gain leadership experience with lab assignments and applied research. On the other hand, the pressure to produce applied research can conflict with academic schedules and norms. Similar to Holley's description of interdisciplinary programs in Chapter 5, Mendoza discusses the potential of industry-sponsored research to thwart the depth of content expertise by doctoral students, which can impact effective socialization.

Despite women approaching equal representation in doctoral education today, Chapter 7 indicates disciplinary experiences reflect the lack of gender equity across disciplines. Margaret Saltee examines three areas of doctoral education where students' experiences are different. The three areas examined are financial aid, advising relationships and time to degree rates. The author aims to create an awareness of inequitable gender outcomes and ensure male and female students' preparation is not disadvantaged in terms of gender.

In Chapter 8, Catherine Millet and Michael Nettles examine the extent that marital status (married defined as married or had domestic partner) influences persistence in a doctoral program. The two groups of interest for this study, committed or single, reflected some variation, but the authors found married students were more likely than single students to experience conflict balancing family and academic roles. Suggestions for married doctoral students are to connect with other doctoral students, faculty advisors and mentors. If possible programs need to align student research interests with faculty research interests. Just as connectivity in graduate school is positively related to persistence and completion, the lack of connectivity can

have a negative impact for students' socialization, development and retention.

In Chapter 9, the Rachelle Winkle-Wagner, Susan Johnson, Carla Morelon-Quainoo and Lilia Santiago examine the experiences and factors that affect students of color in advanced degrees. In a qualitative study the authors found faculty support, interest and mentoring relationships were important for students of color. The students struggled with lack of diversity and little interaction among different minority groups. Students often countered lack of support with a reliance on off campus support systems. The authors concluded institutions should recognize students' isolating experiences and help to integrate and engage students of color. The recommendations from Part IV support Tinto's well-known integration theory as outlined in his 1993 book (Tinto, 1993) and reveal the complex intersections of marital status, race, ethnicity and gender status.

Doctoral students are developing, growing and changing, Susan Gardner contends in Chapter 10. Drawing on McEwen (cited in Gardner Chapter 10) three categories of developmental theories are discussed: psychosocial, social identity and cognitive-structural theories. Psychosocial theory refers to the growth or change related to how a student views his/her abilities or self-efficacy. Social identity theory refers to how students make sense of their social identities as emerging scholars and role as novice within the scholarly enterprise. Cognitive structural theory refers to the development of students' moral compass, spirituality and voice. Each category of development and growth needs attention, support and opportunity to develop. Gardner supports a "holistic view of doctoral growth" (p 218) and recognition of all three categories- psychosocial, social and cognitive structural- in successful socialization efforts.

Not only are doctoral students experiencing change and development today's doctoral students reflect a diverse adult student population. The doctorate has two related goals for students: knowledge creation and professional preparation. In Chapter 11, Carol Kasworm and Tuere Bowles argue the diversity in doctoral populations represents a complex set of commitments. Successful preparation and knowledge creation require a shift in how

adult doctoral students are perceived. Three perspectives from the literature and research on adult learning are examined: self-directed learning, transformative learning and communities of practice. Self-directed learning evolves in stages as students move from initial dependent learners to the final stage of self-directed learners. Effective doctoral programming recognizes the need for adult students to self-direct and engage in reflective examination of knowledge. Fostering self-directed learning activities can help develop critical examiners of knowledge and build abilities to synthesize literature both necessary components of successful doctoral students. “Self-directed” learning posits as students age the need to “self-direct” their learning experiences, grounded in their own lives of work, college, family, is stronger (Knowles, Holton, & Swanson, 2005).

During doctoral studies, students may experience a new sense of self through a “life altering set of events” (p 232). Making sense of experiences and realizations in graduate school requires support from mentors and peers who help foster a new sense of self and help students transform learning to new perspectives and understandings. Finally, Wenger’s communities of practice describe students and faculty who interact on an ongoing basis and learn together. Leadership is shared among the members of the group. The limited literature on doctoral cohorts reflects the importance of doctoral communities of practice (Ali & Kohun, 2006; Barnett, 2000; Mullen, 2003). The authors conclude responding to the changing clientele in doctoral programs requires recognition of how adults learn, synthesize and internalize new knowledge.

One of the book’s most interesting discussions Dawn Shinew and Tami Moore in Chapter 12 discuss the importance of epistemological studies in graduate school as a component of scholarly development. A case study of one course examines how students increased awareness of assumptions about knowledge and how those assumptions shape decisions in research. Previous students shared experiences analyzing the beliefs and values of a diverse set of methodologies and disciplinary approaches. The students benefitted from the multiple perspectives and stretched intellectual muscle. By embracing unfamiliar arguments or assumptions students gained skills in understanding the multiple disciplinary approaches to

research. Expanding the boundaries of knowledge facilitated the socialization of students and led to a scholarly exploration of multi-disciplinary conceptual understandings. Students were able to articulate the philosophical assumptions of their chosen disciplines. The authors recommend doctoral programs integrate epistemological courses early in the programs. Faculty are also encouraged to present research findings including a discussion of the “processes and beliefs that shaped their research” (p 258).

A tenet and strength of this book is that the authors advocate organizational and individual change in perceptions, norms, and practices in doctoral education that have the potential to positively impact doctoral attrition and to enhance the socialization, development and competency of future “stewards of the discipline” (Golde & Walker, 2006). The book builds on the topic of doctoral attrition. Doctoral student attrition rates are greater than 50 percent in some departments (Golde & Walker, 2006) although there is variation among disciplines, institutional types and program structure (Ali & Kohun, 2006; Lovitts, 1996, 2001; Ph.D. Program Completion Data, 2010). High doctoral attrition rates can lead to high opportunity costs for institutions, faculty who work with the students and for doctoral students (Smallwood, 2004). Change is a recurring theme in the book and relevant to all the stakeholders in the doctoral process. The role and responsibility of stakeholders in facilitating and fostering successful doctoral preparation are examined including students, departments, institutions and external agencies or associations. The book is well crafted, scholarly and thorough while also identifying important future research areas.

An expanded view of doctoral student socialization and intersections of discipline, age, gender, marital status, race, and ethnicity are explored. The authors review existing literature and theory and support Tinto’s (1993) “integration” theory but expand research areas to include adult learning, social identity and epistemological development. The chapters demonstrate theoretical and practical applications for the assessment and continuous improvement of doctoral programs. An insightful book for emerging scholars, faculty, institutions and associations the book supplants existing doctoral socialization theories

and provides multiple insights for improving and strengthening doctoral programs. For me, doctoral socialization, development and growth reflect a journey of learning, observation and reflection. Throughout this book doctoral students are challenged (and have the potential) to impact institutions (universities, programs, associations) and become change agents shaping their own doctoral journey. The transformation of the doctoral experience is an exciting possibility for emerging scholars, under-represented students and society as a whole.

References

- Ali, A., & Kohun, F. (2006). Dealing with Isolation Feelings in IS Doctoral Programs. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 1(1), 21-33.
- Barnett (2000). Cohorts in educational leadership programs: Benefits, difficulties, and the potential for developing school leaders. *Educational administration quarterly*, 36(2), 255.
- Golde, C. M. (2005). The Role of the Department and Discipline in Doctoral Student Attrition: Lessons from Four Departments. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76(6), 669-700.
- Golde, C. M., & Gallagher, H. A. (1999). The challenges of conducting interdisciplinary research in traditional doctoral programs. *Ecosystems*, 2(4), 281-285.
- Golde, C. M., & Walker, G. E. (2006). *Envisioning the future of doctoral education : preparing stewards of the discipline, Carnegie essays on the doctorate* (Vol. 1). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2005). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development*: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Lovitts, B. E. (1996). Who is Responsible for Graduate Student Attrition: The Individual or the Institution: Toward an explanation of the high and persistent rate of attrition. *Paper presented at American Educational Research Association*, (Report), 1-22
- Lovitts, B. E. (2001). *Leaving the ivory tower: The causes and consequences of departure from doctoral study*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- McAlpine, L. (2006). Reframing our approach to doctoral programs: an integrative framework for action and

- research. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 25(1), 3.
- Mullen, C. W. (2003). The WIT Cohort: a case study of informal doctoral mentoring. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 27(4), 411-426.
- Ph.D. Program Completion Data, 2010, from <http://www.phdcompletion.org>.
- Smallwood, S. (2004). Doctor Dropout. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50(19), A10-A12.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (Vol. 2nd). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

About the Reviewer

Bobbie Everett Frye is currently Director of Institutional Research at Central Piedmont Community College in Charlotte, NC. She is also a doctoral student in Adult and Community College Education at NC State University in the Dept of Leadership, Policy and Adult and Higher Education. Her research interests include student retention, organizational change and doctoral education.

Copyright is retained by the first or sole author, who grants right of first publication to the *Education Review*.

Education Review/Reseñas Educativas is a project of the National Education Policy Center <http://nepc.colorado.edu>



Editors

Gene V Glass

glass@edrev.info

Gustavo Fischman

fischman@edrev.info

Melissa Cast-Brede

cast-brede@edrev.info
